UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,888	12/05/2003	Todd D. Wakefield	03760.021/5138 P	9224

7590 05/31/2006

Parsons Behle & Latimer
Suite 1800
201 South Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
CAO, PHUONG THAO	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2164	

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/729,888	WAKEFIELD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phuong-Thao Cao	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 December 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 May 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/8/04 and 1/7/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Application filed on 12/05/2003.

2. claims 1-28 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed by Applicant on 03/08/2004 and 01/07/2005 have been received and considered. Copies of the reviewed IDS(s) are enclosed with this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 15 recites the limitation "said input device set" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 15-18 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claims 15-18 and 26-27, these claims recite the process of providing a service to integrate mixed format data, but fails to recite a tangible result, a requirement for compliance with the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 101 in view of the Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, published on 26 October 2005, which can be found at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/guidelines101_20051026.pdf>, particularly with respect to ANNEX IV Computer-Related Nonstatutory Subject Matter, beginning on page 50.

For a result to be tangible, it must be more than just a thought or a computation; it must have real-world value rather than an abstract result. For instance, note that the limitations of claims 19-25 and 28 are not rejected, since they recite the function of producing a new database containing the integrated data produced by said integrating or displaying the integrated data,

whereas (for instance), independent claims 1, 17 and 34 merely cite 'integrating the produced data with the data tuples of the structured data' or 'data mining integrated data' as the result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 11-16, 18, 20 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haug et al. (US Patent No 6,292,771).

As to claim 1, Haug et al. teach:

"A system for providing a service to integrate structured and unstructured data" (see Abstract and [column 4, lines 40-65]), comprising:

"a processing element" (see [column 4, lines 40-60] wherein computer 100 or computer system 104 is equivalent to Applicant's "processing element");

"one or more data access ports, said ports providing access to data by said processing element" (see [column 4, lines 40-60] and Fig. 1 wherein connecting between storage device 103 to computer 100 and computer 104 implies the inclusion of data access ports as illustrated in Applicant's claim language);

"a set of one or more input devices readable by said processing element" (see [column 4, lines 40-60] and Fig. 1 wherein keyboards 101, 105 and 108 is a set of input devices);

"a storage device, said storage device containing instructions executable by said processing element to perform the functions of" (see [column 4, lines 40-65] and Fig.1):

"reading a first access reference through said input device set, the first access reference referencing a customer's database of structured data containing a set of data tuples" (see [column 5, lines 5-20] wherein data in a table such as the type of patient and the type of physician are equivalent to Applicant's "structured data" and rows in a table represent a set of data tuples as illustrated in Applicant's claim language, local database or Oracle database is equivalent to Applicant's "a customer's database of structured data containing a set of data tuples", and the disclosure of entry clerk entering information into the database of the hospital information system inherently includes that the clerk must provide some access reference to that database and the system must read this access reference before connecting the database to the user interface);

"reading a second access reference through said input device set, the second access reference referencing a customer's source of unstructured data, the unstructured data including free text relatable to the data tuples of the structured data" ((see [column 5, lines 5-20] wherein database containing a column in the table as disclosed in which a free-text description of the reason for admission for each specific patient is stored is equivalent to Applicant's "source of unstructured data", and the disclosure of entry clerk entering information into the database of the hospital information system inherently includes that the clerk must provide some access reference to that database and the system must read this access reference before connecting the database to the user interface);

"accessing a source of unstructured data through said second access reference" (see [column 5, lines 5-20 and 20-30] wherein the disclosure of obtaining free-text information must include accessing its source as illustrated in Applicant's claim language);

"interpreting the free text of the unstructured data to produce a set of construed data reflecting at least one relational fact conveyed in the free text, each construed datum relatable to a data tuple of the structured data" (see [column 5, lines 20-35 and 40-67], [column 6, lines 1-10], [column 8, lines 55-60] and Fig. 5 wherein the interpretive ICD9 codes is equivalent to Applicant's "a set of construed data", and each interpretive ICD9 code related to the patient record (equivalent to a data tuple of the structured data) through a patient id [column 6, lines 1-3]);

"accessing a database of structured data" (see [column 5, lines 10-20 and 33-36] wherein the Oracle database is equivalent to Applicant's "database of structured data"); and

"integrating the produced data with the data tuples of the structured data" (see [column 6, lines 1-10] wherein interpretive ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant's "produced data", patient record is equivalent to Applicant's "data tuples of the structured data", and the disclosure of writing the patient id and interpretive ICD9 code to the patient record is equivalent the integrating as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"wherein said accessing the source of unstructured data accesses text contained within the database of structured data" (see [column 5, lines 5-20] discloses that free-text description of the reason for admission (unstructured data or text) is stored in the same table in a local database as other patient information such as the type of patient, patient id and the type of physician (structured data)).

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"wherein said instructions are further executable to perform the function of applying caseframes while performing said interpreting the free text" (see [column 5, lines 40-65] and Fig. 5 wherein a syntactic parsetree as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant's "caseframes"; also see [column 7, lines 20-30] wherein proposed syntactic relations is equivalent to Applicant's "caseframes").

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"wherein said instructions are further executable to perform the function of inserting the produced data into the database of structured data referenced by first access reference while performing said integrating the produced data" (see [column 6, lines 1-15] wherein the interpretive ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant's "produced data", patient record is equivalent

to Applicant's "structured data", and the disclosure of writing the patient id and interpretive ICD9 record to the patient record on the HELP system implies the inserting the produced data as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"wherein said instruction are further executable to store an integrated database while performing said integrating the produced data" (see [column 5, lines 5-20 and 33-38] wherein the Oracle database of the HELP system, in which the interpretation of the free text (ICD9 code) is inserted, is equivalent to Applicant's "integrated database").

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"wherein the integrated data produced by the performance of said integrating the produced data includes reference information to the original free text for construed data" (see [column 6, lines 1-10] wherein the ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant's "construed data" and the disclosure of getting a list of patient admissions from the preceding day along with the free-text and the ICD9 code implies there must include some reference information to the original free text as illustrated in Applicant's claim language to be able to get the original free-text and the corresponding ICD9 code together as disclosed).

As to claim 13, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"wherein said instructions are further executable to perform data mining on the integrated data" (see [column 1, lines 20-40] and [column 5, lines 30-35] wherein the disclosure of data in coded form used in research, decision support, quality assurance and analysis is equivalent to data mining as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"wherein said instructions are further executable to render a visual representation all or a part of the integrated data" (see [column 6, lines 3-9] wherein a list of patient admissions along with the free-text and the ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant's "visual representation").

As to claim 15, Haug et al. teach:

"A method for providing a service to integrate structured and unstructured data" (see Abstract and [column 4, lines 40-65]), comprising the steps of:

"reading a first access reference through said input device set, the first access reference referencing a customer's database of structured data containing a set of data tuples" (see [column 5, lines 5-20] wherein data in a table such as the type of patient and the type of physician are

equivalent to Applicant's "structured data" and rows in a table represent a set of data tuples as illustrated in Applicant's claim language, local database or Oracle database is equivalent to Applicant's "a customer's database of structured data containing a set of data tuples", and the disclosure of entry clerk entering information into the database of the hospital information system inherently includes that the clerk must provide some access reference to that database and the system must read this access reference before connecting the database to the user interface);

"reading a second access reference through said input device set, the second access reference referencing a customer's source of unstructured data, the unstructured data including free text relatable to the data tuples of the structured data" ((see [column 5, lines 5-20] wherein database containing a column in the table as disclosed in which a free-text description of the reason for admission for each specific patient is stored is equivalent to Applicant's "source of unstructured data", and the disclosure of entry clerk entering information into the database of the hospital information system inherently includes that the clerk must provide some access reference to that database and the system must read this access reference before connecting the database to the user interface);

"accessing a source of unstructured data through said second access reference" (see [column 5, lines 5-20 and 20-30] wherein the disclosure of obtaining free-text information must include accessing its source as illustrated in Applicant's claim language);

"interpreting the free text of the unstructured data to produce a set of construed data reflecting at least one relational fact conveyed in the free text, each construed datum relatable to a data tuple of the structured data" (see [column 5, lines 20-35 and 40-67], [column 6, lines 1-10], [column 8, lines 55-60] and Fig. 5 wherein the interpretive ICD9 codes is equivalent to

Applicant's "a set of construed data", and each interpretive ICD9 code related to the patient record (equivalent to a data tuple of the structured data) through a patient id [column 6, lines 1-3]);

"accessing a database of structured data" (see [column 5, lines 10-20 and 33-36] wherein the Oracle database is equivalent to Applicant's "database of structured data"); and

"integrating the produced data with the data tuples of the structured data" (see [column 6, lines 1-10] wherein interpretive ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant's "produced data", patient record is equivalent to Applicant's "data tuples of the structured data", and the disclosure of writing the patient id and interpretive ICD9 code to the patient record is equivalent the integrating as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 15 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"wherein said accessing the source of unstructured data accesses text contained within the database of structured data" (see [column 5, lines 5-20] discloses that free-text description of the reason for admission (unstructured data or text) is stored in the same table in a local database as other patient information such as the type of patient, patient id and the type of physician (structured data)).

As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 15 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"further comprising the step of applying caseframes while performing said interpreting the free text" (see [column 5, lines 40-65] and Fig. 5 wherein a syntactic parsetree as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant's "caseframes"; also see [column 7, lines 20-30] wherein proposed syntactic relations is equivalent to Applicant's "caseframes").

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 15 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"further comprising the step of inserting the produced data into the database of structured data referenced by first access reference while performing said integrating the produced data" (see [column 6, lines 1-15] wherein the interpretive ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant's "produced data", patient record is equivalent to Applicant's "structured data", and the disclosure of writing the patient id and interpretive ICD9 record to the patient record on the HELP system implies the inserting the produced data as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 25, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 15 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"further comprising the step of storing an integrated database while performing said integrating the produced data" (see [column 5, lines 5-20 and 33-38] wherein the Oracle database

of the HELP system, in which the interpretation of the free text (ICD9 code) is inserted, is equivalent to Applicant's "integrated database").

As to claim 26, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 15 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"wherein the integrated data produced by the performance of said integrating the produced data includes reference information to the original free text for construed data" (see [column 6, lines 1-10] wherein the ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant's "construed data" and the disclosure of getting a list of patient admissions from the preceding day along with the free-text and the ICD9 code implies there must include some reference information to the original free text as illustrated in Applicant's claim language to be able to get the original free-text and the corresponding ICD9 code together as disclosed).

As to claim 27, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 15 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"further comprising the step of data mining the integrated data" (see [column 1, lines 20-40] and [column 5, lines 30-35] wherein the disclosure of data in coded form used in research, decision support, quality assurance and analysis is equivalent to data mining as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 28, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 15 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. teach:

"further comprising the step of rendering a visual representation all or a part of the integrated data" (see [column 6, lines 3-9] wherein a list of patient admissions along with the free-text and the ICD9 code is equivalent to Applicant's "visual representation").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 3 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haug et al. (US Patent No 6,292,771) as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of Chen et al. (Publication No US 2003/0149586).

As to claims 3 and 17, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 15 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. do not teach "wherein said first access reference and said second access reference reference separate data sources".

Chen et al. teach "wherein said first access reference and said second access reference reference separate data sources" (see [0049] and [0154] for the disclosure of deriving information from more than one information source; and different data sources possess different access reference; also see [0141] and [0142]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Haug et al. by the teaching of Chen et al., since accessing unstructured data and accessing structured data from different sources provides an efficient way to combine information from different systems comprised in a complex operational environment for tracking and analyzing activities (see Chen et al., [0141] and [0142]).

12. Claims 5, 7-8, 19 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haug et al. (US Patent No 6,292,771) as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and further in view of Smith et al. (US Patent No 6,052,693).

As to claims 5 and 19, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 15, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. do not teach "reading a storage reference through said input device set, the storage reference providing a location for a product database; producing a new database containing the integrated data produced by said integrating; and storing the new database to the location reference by the storage reference".

Smith et al. teach "reading a storage reference through said input device set, the storage reference providing a location for a product database; producing a new database containing the

integrated data produced by said integrating; and storing the new database to the location reference by the storage reference" (see Abstract, [column 2, lines 45-67], [column 3, lines 5-10 and 65-67], [column 4, lines 1-25], and [column 16, lines 10-40] wherein the disclosure of creating and build a database to contain the extracted information inherently includes reading a storage reference and storing the database to the location reference by the storage reference).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Haug et al. by the teaching of Smith et al., since producing a new database containing the integrated data provides an additional and effective way to store and manipulate the data without changing the database schema of the present database system.

As to claims 7 and 21, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 15, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. do not teach "creating a new database while performing said integrating the produced data".

Smith et al. teach "creating a new database while performing said integrating the produced data" (see Abstract, [column 2, lines 62-67], [column 3, lines 65-67], [column 4, lines 1-25], and [column 16, lines 10-40]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Haug et al. by the teaching of Smith et al., since creating a new database while performing said integrating the produced data provides an additional and effective way to store and manipulate the data without changing the database schema of the present database system.

As to claims 8 and 22, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 7 and 21, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. as modified teach "to produce a new relational database containing the integrated data produced by said integrating" (see Haug et al., [column 5, lines 5-20] wherein the disclosure of table in a local database implies relational database, and Smith et al., Abstract).

13. Claims 9-10 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haug et al. (US Patent No 6,292,771) in view of Smith et al. (US Patent No 6,052,693) as applied to claims 7 and 21 above, and further in view of Chen et al. (Publication No US 2003/0149586).

As to claims 9 and 23, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 7 and 21, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. as modified does not teach "produce a file containing the integrated data produced by said integrating".

Chen et al. teach "produce a file containing the integrated data produced by said integrating" (see [0008], [0050], [0146] and [0149] wherein template is a file containing the integrated data as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Haug et al. as modified by the teaching of Chen et al.,

since producing or including a file containing the integrated data provide an effective way to communicate data from one system to another system (see Chen et al., [0146]).

As to claims 10 and 24, these claims are rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claims 9, 26 and 42 respectively, and are similarly rejected including the following:

Haug et al. as modified does not teach "produce a file having a format selected from the group of XML (or XML file), character separated values, spreadsheet formats and file-based database structures".

Chen et al. teach "produce a file having a format selected from the group of XML (or XML file), character separated values, spreadsheet formats and file-based database structures" and "wherein the new database has a format selected from the group of XML, character separated values, spreadsheet formats and file-based database structure" (see [0049], [0146]-[0149] wherein template file is equivalent to Applicant's "file").

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Haug et al. as modified by the teaching of Chen et al., since adding the feature of file having a format selected from the group of XML, character separated values, spreadsheet formats and file-based database structure provides the system with effective and flexible choices for storing, manipulating and communicating the data.

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Saldanha et al. (Publication No US 2003/0167266) teach a method and system for converting plain text into structured data.

Alpha et al. (US Patent No 6,980,976) teach a method and system to built an combined index of the structured and unstructured data columns.

Saffer et al. (US Patent No 6,718,336) teach a data import system enabling access to data of multiple types from multiple data sources of different format and providing an interface for importing data into a data analysis system. The processing of a data set may including merging a first and second data set to produce the final data representation and transforming a text string to a series of attributes.

Mohan et al. (US Patent No 6,970,881) teach a method and system for analyzing and categorizing unstructured data such that conventional structured data access techniques can be utilized over unstructured data objects.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PTC

May 25, 2006

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167